

NOTE ON THE GENUS KUHLLIA.

BY THEODORE GILL.

The genus *Dules* was first named by Cuvier and Valenciennes in 1829, in the *Histoire Naturelle des Poissons* (III, 111), for fishes resembling *Centropristes*, but distinguished by the presence of only six branchiostegal rays. The genus is divided into two sections, the first with three points to the opercle and an undivided dorsal (as in *Centropristes*) and the second with two points to the opercle and an emarginate dorsal. The name has been restricted to the first section for many years, and for the second section (not related to *Centropristes*) the generic name *Kuhllia*, given by Gill in 1861, has been used. Recently, however, Mr. Henry W. Fowler, in the *Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila.*, 1906 (p. 510), has contended that *Kuhllia* "is superseded by *Dules* Cuvier, *Règne Animal*, ed. 2, II, 1829, p. 147 (type *Centropomus rupestris* Lacépède by first species)."

Cuvier in the *Règne Animal* especially refers, in a footnote, to the "*Dules auriga* Cuv. et Val., III, li," etc., and that work was published in advance of the *Règne Animal*. In accordance with Mr. Fowler's own principles, then, *Kuhllia* should be retained as well as the family name *Kuhllidæ*, and not *Dules* and *Dulidæ* (or *Dulidæ*).

Mr. Fowler also remarks that "the specific name of the species generally known as *Kuhllia malo* should be "*Dules mato* Lesson, *Voy. aut. Mond. Coquille*, *Zool.*, III, 1830 (March 22, 1828),¹ p. 223, thus having priority over *Dules malo* Valenciennes, *Hist. Nat. Poiss.*, VII, 1831, p. 360."

Inasmuch, however, as Lesson, at the place cited, especially quotes "*Dules malo* Cuv., *Poiss.*, t. VII, p. 479," it is obvious that the volume in question (VII) must have been set up and published before the description by Lesson was even in print, notwithstanding the dates of the title-pages.

It may be added that the proper indigenous Tahitian name of the *Kuhllia* appears to have been *Mato* and not *Malo*, and Cuvier's name may have resulted from a typographical error, in which case *Kuhllia mato* would be the correct form.

¹ It is not evident what is meant by the date "March 22, 1828"; certainly the volume of the *Coquille* could not have been published then.